Department of Finance and Treasury Board
Annual Accountability Report
for the Fiscal Year
2013-2014

Table of Contents

1.0 Accountability Statement 3

2.0 Message from the Minister..... 4

3.0 Financial Results..... 5

4.0 Measuring our Performance..... 6-15

Appendix A: Public Interest Disclosure of Wrongdoing 16

Appendix B: Treasury Board Office Survey Results..... 17

1.0 Accountability Statement

The Accountability Report of the Department of Finance and Treasury Board for the year ended March 31, 2014 is prepared pursuant to the *Finance Act* and government policies and guidelines. These authorities require the reporting of outcomes against the Department's Statement of Mandate for the fiscal year 2013-2014. The reporting of the Department's outcomes necessarily includes estimates, judgments and opinions by Department management.

We acknowledge that this Accountability Report is the responsibility of Department management. The report is, to the extent possible, a complete and accurate representation of outcomes relative to the goals and priorities set out in the Statements of Mandate for the Department of Finance and the Treasury Board Office for 2013-2014

Honourable Diana Whalen
Minister of Finance & Treasury Board

Margaret MacDonald
Deputy Minister of Finance & Treasury Board

2.0 Message from the Minister

I am pleased to present the 2013-2014 Accountability Report for the Department of Finance and Treasury Board.

The annual Accountability Report is an opportunity to highlight department activities and accomplishments across key policy and program areas and demonstrate performance in the day-to-day activities to help government operate efficiently and effectively.

The 2013-2014 fiscal year was a year of significant transition. During the year the Department of Finance and the Treasury Board Office merged to provide better coordination of policy and financial advice and services required of a central government agency. This accountability report describes the accomplishments of both organizations relative to the individual mandate statements published in the spring of 2013.

In addition, on March 7, 2014, Government announced the transfer of several services previously provided by the Department of Finance and Treasury Board to the new Department of Internal Services. The realignment of these services will improve efficiency, reduce service overlaps and improve responsiveness to clients and citizens. This accountability report includes measures for divisions that were part of Finance and Treasury Board in 2013-2014. Reporting for these divisions will transition to the Department of Internal Services in 2014-2015.

Departmental achievements in 2013-2014 include:

- Confirmation of the province's credit rating by all three rating agencies
- Achieving a rating of A (high) by DBRS.
- Leading all Canadian provinces in the transition to electronic payments.
- Survey results show that 90% of clients feel Treasury Board provides timely and helpful advice on submissions.

These and many other achievements are a testament to the hard work of department staff. I would like to take this opportunity to thank each and every employee of the department for their ongoing dedication and service to the government and to the people of Nova Scotia.

As Minister of Finance and Treasury Board, I look forward to continuing the important work of the Department to further advance the priorities of government.

Honourable Diana Whalen
Minister of Finance and Treasury Board
Date:

3.0 Financial Results

Department of Finance & Treasury Board			
	2013-2014 Estimate	**2013-2014 Actual**	**Variance**
Program & Service Area	($thousands)	($thousands)	($thousands)
Program Expenses:			
Senior Management	5,139	4,535	(604)
Controller's Division	30,813	30,936	123
Provincial Budgetary Planning & Coordination	812	780	(32)
Corporate Services Unit	1,458	1,450	(8)
Fiscal and Economic Policy	3,222	3,003	(219)
Total Program Expenses (Note 1)	41,444	40,704	(740)
Additional Information:			
Fees and Other Charges	28	41	13
Ordinary Recoveries (Note 2)	2,479	5,168	2,689
TCA Purchase Requirements (Note 3)	5,379	5,208	(171)
Provincial Funded Staff (FTEs) Net	213.5	192.5	(21)

Notes: Significant Variance Explanations: 2013-14 Estimate to 2013-2014 Actual

1. Savings from vacant positions offset by increased operating expenses for a net under expenditure ($372K), and amortization savings of ($368K) due to changes in capital projects in-use dates.
2. Increased recoveries from Municipalities and government entities for SAP support, maintenance and development.
3. TCA underspend due to delay in several projects.

4.0 Measuring Our Performance

Outcome 1 – Produce a sound fiscal plan and provide timely financial information for the Province of Nova Scotia

Measure: Credit ratings by major rating agencies

What does the measure tell us?
A credit rating is an independent evaluation of a borrower's ability and willingness to pay interest and to repay principal. Rating firms provide investors with these measures of the credit quality of bonds or other financial instruments. A credit rating indirectly affects the borrower's borrowing costs and the investor's expected rate of return since an investor will demand a higher return on a more risky, lower rated security.

Where are we now?
As of March 31, 2014 the province is rated A (high) by DBRS, A+ by S&P, and Aa2 by Moody's. In 2013-2014 all three rating agencies confirmed that province's credit rating, and DBRS raised the province's rating to A (high).

A chart outlining individual provincial ratings can be found in the Province's 2013 – 2014 Budget Assumptions and Schedules on page 37:
http://www.novascotia.ca/finance/site-finance/media/finance/budget2014/Budget_Assumptions_And_Schedules.pdf

The following links will take you to each agency's rating methodology:

S&P: http://img.en25.com/Web/StandardandPoors/Ratings_Definitions.pdf

Moody's: http://www.moodys.com/Pages/amr002002.aspx

DBRS: http://www.dbrs.com/research/239144/rating-canadian-provincial-governments.pdf

Where do we want to go?
The long-term goal is to be rated double A with a stable outlook (or trend) by all three of the major rating agencies.

Measure: Unqualified auditor's report and timely release of consolidated financial statements (Public Accounts Volume 1)

What does the measure tell us?
This measure illustrates the department's commitment to accurate, timely financial reporting and meeting the legislative requirement to release the Public Accounts by September 30th.

Where are we now?
We continue to achieve this measure. Public Accounts for 2012-2013 received an unqualified audit opinion from the Auditor General, and were released on July 31, 2013.

Where do we want to go?
Continue to produce consolidated financial statements that receive an unqualified audit opinion on or before the legislated deadline for reporting of September 30th.

Measure: Timely release of Public Accounts Volume 3

What does the measure tell us?
This measure illustrates the department's commitment to transparency and accountability in financial reporting as well as the commitment to meet the legislative requirement to release the Public Accounts by September 30th.

Where are we now?
This was a new measure for 2013-2014. Volume 3 of Public Accounts for the 2012-2013 fiscal year, containing supplementary information such as compensation disclosure, was released on July 31, 2013 along with the other two volumes of the Provincial Public Accounts.

Where do we want to go?
Continue to deliver Public Accounts Volume 3 on or before the legislated deadline for reporting of September 30th.

Measure: Timely release of Forecast Updates

What does the measure tell us?
The measure supports sound fiscal planning by meeting the legislative requirement to provide updates on the progress of the provincial budget, released on a quarterly basis throughout the fiscal year.

Where are we now?
This was a new measure for 2013-2014. The Department of Finance and Treasury Board met the goal by releasing quarterly forecast updates on the 2013-2014 provincial budget on the following dates: August 19, 2013, December 19, 2013, and April 3, 2014.

Where do we want to go?
Continue to meet legislative requirements and to support sound fiscal planning by reporting on the progress of the provincial budget through the release of quarterly forecast updates.

Outcome 2 – Provide financial policy and management advice based on fiscal prudence and best practice

Measure: Client survey to measure quality, timeliness and relevance of advice and service from Finance and Treasury Board in key policy and process areas

What does the measure tell us?
The development of sound financial policy helps to support the implementation of best practices and ultimately fiscal prudence. Surveying client satisfaction in key areas can help the Department provide quality, timely and relevant advice regarding policy and management.

Where are we now?
This was a new measure for 2013-2014. The goal was to develop an appropriate client satisfaction survey to provide feedback in this area. Work is underway to develop a survey tool to measure satisfaction with the work of the Department. The Department continues to review Management Manual policies older than three years and update as necessary. The Department continues to respond to requests for policy development and advice in a timely fashion and share information and best practice.

Where do we want to go in the future?
Implement the client satisfaction survey in 2014-2015 and continue to review Management Manual policies every three years and update if necessary.

Outcome 3 – Maximize efficiency and effectiveness of central client services

Measure: Percentage of pay delivered to employees on defined pay schedule with no errors

What does the measure tell us?
This measure indicates the timeliness and accuracy of the delivery of payroll transactions using approved processes to mitigate errors within an acceptable range.

Where are we now?
This was a new measure and the goal for 2013-2014 was to mitigate errors in payroll transactions within an acceptable range to ensure delivery on the defined pay schedule. The Payroll and Client Services Division was successful in delivering all pay transactions using approved practices to employees within an acceptable period. Payroll and Client Services has transferred to the Internal Services Department for the 2014-2015 fiscal year.

Where do we want to go in the future?
To continue to deliver pay to employees within the defined pay schedule while mitigating errors using approved practices and continuing to review and improve processes to reduce the number of errors and need for mitigation. To facilitate a smooth transition to the Internal Services Department without impacting service delivery.

Measure: Percentage of payroll forms and time reports completed properly and filed on time

What does the measure tell us?
This measure addresses the timely and accurate completion and filing of payroll forms and time reports using approved processes to mitigate errors within an acceptable range.

Where are we now?
This was a new measure and the goal for 2013-2014 was to mitigate all errors associated with the completion or filing of payroll forms and time reports within an acceptable range to ensure payroll delivery on time. This year the Payroll and Client Services Division was able to mitigate challenges using approved practices in order to complete and file payroll forms and time reports on time. Payroll and Client Services has transferred to the Internal Services Department for the 2014-2015 fiscal year.

Where do we want to go in the future?
To continue to complete and file payroll forms and time reports properly and on time by using approved processes to mitigate errors and to work with our process partners in other departments and agencies to further improve those processes. To facilitate a smooth transition to the Internal Services Department without impacting service delivery.

Measure: Percentage of major payment deadlines met: Income Assistance, Payroll, Labour Market Payments. Percentage of payments by electronic funds transfer (EFT)

What does the measure tell us?
This measure ensures the timely and accurate delivery of Income Assistance, Payroll, and Labour Market Payments. It also tracks the number of payments made using EFT which is more efficient than processing payments using paper cheques.

Where are we now?
The goal for 2013-2014 was to continue to have 100% compliance in the delivery of payments. This goal was met with 100% of Income Assistance, Payroll, and Labour Market Payments being made by deadline.

The goal for 2013-2014 was to shift payment processes to have 75% of payments go through EFT. This goal has been met with 75% of Nova Scotia's Income Assistance, Payroll, and Labour Market Payments now being made by EFT instead of paper cheque. This has greatly improved client service and workload efficiency. In fact, Nova Scotia is the leading province in all of Canada for electronic payments.

Operational Accounting has transferred to the Internal Services Department for the 2014-2015 fiscal year.

Where do we want to go in the future?
To continue to have 100% compliance when meeting payment deadlines. To have 95% of payments processes through EFT in 2014-2015. To continue to be a Canadian leader in EFT payments by working with the federal government to have 100% of provincial payments made through EFT by the year 2016. To facilitate a smooth transition to the Internal Services Department without impacting service delivery.

Outcome 4 – Provide leadership in fiscal, economic and financial regulatory policy across government to support decision making

Measure: Client survey to measure quality, timeliness and relevance of advice and service from Finance and Treasury Board in key policy and process areas

What does the measure tell us?
This measure supports sound decision making by ensuring there is leadership in fiscal, economic and financial regulatory policy across government. Surveying the quality, timeliness and relevance of advice and service provided by Finance and Treasury Board will provide the data and information on which to base future decision making and effective advice to Government entities.

Where are we now?
This was a new measure for 2013-2014. The goal was to develop an appropriate client survey to measure quality, timeliness and relevance of advice and service in key policy and process areas. Work is underway with the Public Service Commission to develop the survey tool with questions that are relevant to the work of Finance and Treasury Board. The Department continues to build and maintain networks across government; liaise with other central agencies to ensure a shared proactive approach; maintain knowledge base through ongoing research and collaboration across all levels of government.

Where do we want to go in the future?
To t conduct the initial client survey in 2014-2015, establish baseline satisfaction results and work to improve survey results.. Continue to provide leadership in fiscal, economic and financial regulatory policy across government to support decision making.

Outcome 5 – Superior Support and Guidance to Clients interacting with Treasury Board

Measure: A survey of clients required to provide submissions to or interact with Treasury Board (TB) and/or the broader fiscal management processes is conducted to identify the quality and effectiveness of the information, advice, analysis and coordination provided to support the fiscal management process and achieving fiscal sustainability. The responses below address the key functions of the budgeting, tangible capital asset management, Statement of Mandate/Accountability Reporting, and strategic expenditure management processes.

What does the measure tell us?
The survey results identify whether the clients required to provide submissions to or interact with TB and/or the broader fiscal management processes were provided effective timely information, advice, analysis, and coordination by the TB Division. The results will guide TB in improving the quality of its service to ensure well supported analyses and documentation is available to TB for sound decision-making.

Where are we now?
In 2012-13 a survey was conducted which forms the baseline results to which 2013-14 survey results will be compared.

Where do we want to go in the future?
TB Division seeks a result of 80% or more of respondents agreeing or agreeing strongly with the survey questions. The statistical values referenced refer to the aggregate of the "agree and strongly agree" results.

Budget Process

- TB could improve its perceived performance on several budget issues. While 63% indicate that the pre-budget meetings are beneficial, favorable feedback regarding Net Impact Targets declined in 2013-14. TB will examine methods to improve the pre-budget process and offer greater clarity with respect to information.

- The survey results indicate there is a need to re-visit the budget template. Less than half saw the budget template as an effective tool to submit department pressures and reductions. Similarly, less than half indicated that the information requested for each pressure and reduction positively impacted the budget process and added value to the overall budget process.

- Over 60% perceived communications for the budget process, due dates, and timelines as appropriate; however, there was a slight decline in the percentage compared to 12-13

- Feedback regarding the inclusion of FTEs, in the departmental targets, was positive with 73% agreeing that this offers greater control and monitoring of FTEs.

- The perception is that the overall length of the budget cycle is appropriate with 61 % supporting the current length. As well, indications are that an earlier start date would be beneficial.

Tangible Capital Asset (TCA) Process

- 81% of respondents perceive that TB provides effective guidance for TCA submission requirements (content and process). This is up from 57% last year and TB will seek to maintain excellent service performance to maintain or better our perceived performance results.

- Survey responses regarding the clarity of parameters (limits on total number/cost of project requests) of the TCA program have improved with 67% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that the parameters are clear. While this is an improvement of 17% over last year, the results suggest that the parameters could be clearer. TB will review the information and how it is disseminated to seek further improvements in clarity and understanding.

- Responses regarding TCA deadlines suggest that information is well understood with 96% perceiving that the deadlines are clear. Similarly, awareness of who to contact at TB regarding TCA was 85%, up from 60% last year.

- 70% of respondents believe that there is reasonable lead time to meet required deadlines for TCA submissions. This is a 25% increase in agreement from last year's result and TB hopes to see further improvements in the future.

- 88% of respondents support that TB provides helpful advice and information to inform new or revised TCA submissions. This is a 52% increase over last year's result and TB will seek to maintain excellent service performance to maintain or better our perceived performance results.

Statement of Mandate

- TB scored relatively well on the Statement of Mandate process. Approximately 80% or more of respondents found the content expectations, deadlines, approval and feedback process, and who to contact at TB clear. A similar level of response found the written guidelines informative and that the lead time was reasonable. TB will seek additional methods and events to help departments, public service organizations and crown corps to understand the processes, requirements and how to effectively measure and report performance.

TB Submissions

- TB scored very well on service quality for submissions (90% agree that TB provides timely and helpful advice on process and content). TB will continue in its efforts to support departments in the submission process.

- TB scored equally as well on advice and guidance for governance and accountability of a government agency (89% agree or strongly agree). TB will continue to strive to provide pertinent and timely advice in this process.

Expenditure Management

- As of April 1, 2014, several functions previously carried out by TB are now delivered by the Internal Services Department (ISD). ISD will take over responsibility for shared services and strategic procurement. TB will continue to be responsible for other expenditure management efforts such as program review.

- Survey respondents did not perceive that TB clearly communicated the purposes, parameters and processes of expenditure management projects as favorable responses fell from 53% in 2012-13 to 33% in 2013-14. However, half of respondents did agree that requirements and deadlines were clearly communicated. TB acknowledges these communications could be improved. In the coming year, TB will work to improve the effectiveness of communications in its respective expenditure management areas and to provide sufficient change management resources for major projects

- In 2013-14 there was a 15% decline in the proportion of respondents who perceive that it was clear who to contact at TB; however, there was a 21% increase in those who indicated that they understood how to provide input and feedback on expenditure management projects. The proportion perceiving those departments' input and advice is considered fell by 10%. TB will review the methods utilized to gather and acknowledge feedback and input from departments. A relatively low percentage of respondents, perceive that TB ensures they are made aware of expenditure management project recommendations. TB will work to ensure departmental stakeholders are aware of project recommendations in TB's respective expenditure management areas.

- TB will seek to improve the provision of updates and information to departments in its respective expenditure management areas whenever possible. Feedback, input and advice from departments is vital for expenditure management projects and TB will seek more input from departmental stakeholders to inform sustainability projects.

Outcome 6 – Ensure the Department of Finance and Treasury Board provides a healthy and supportive workplace

Measure: Employee engagement as measured by Department of Finance and Treasury Board employee response rate to corporate How's Work Going surveys (held biennially)

What does the measure tell us?
This measure reflects the degree to which department staffs feel connected and involved with their job and the organization. Department employee engagement is measured every two years as part of the government-wide "How's Work Going?" Survey.

Where are we now?
The departmental engagement score in 2013 was 54 compared to a corporate score of 60. This means that 54% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they felt engaged in the workplace. Department engagement results in several areas did improve in the 2013 survey as compared to 2011 survey. However, other areas declined as did the overall engagement score.

Improving staff engagement continues to be a priority of the Department. In 2013-2014 Finance and Treasury Board implemented the Department's Employee Engagement Plan in an effort to addresses areas of concerns as reported in the 2013 How's Work Going survey.

Where do we want to go?
Improve and meet and/or surpass the corporate engagement results in the 2015 survey.

Measure: Job satisfaction, as measured by the How's Work Going survey

What does the measure tell us?
This measure reflects the degree to which department staff feel satisfied with their role in the organization. Job satisfaction is measured every two years as part of the government-wide "How's Work Going?" Survey.

Where are we now?
The departmental job satisfaction score in 2013 was 56 compared to a corporate score of 65. This means that 56% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they felt satisfied with their job. Efforts to improve job satisfaction will continue in 2014-15 based on employee input and through the on-going implementation of the Department's Employee Engagement Plan.

Where do we want to go in the future?
Improve and meet and/or surpass the corporate job satisfaction results in the 2015 survey.

Appendix A

The Public Interest Disclosure of Wrongdoing Act was proclaimed into law on December 20, 2011.

The Act provides for government employees to be able to come forward if they reasonably believe that a wrongdoing has been committed or is about to be committed and they are acting in good faith.

The Act also protects employees who do disclose from reprisals, by enabling them to lay a complaint of reprisal with the Labor Board.

A Wrongdoing for the purposes of the Act is:

a) a contravention of provincial or federal laws or regulations
b) a misuse or gross mismanagement of public funds or assets
c) an act or omission that creates an imminent risk of a substantial and specific danger to the life, health or safety of persons or the environment, or
d) directing or counselling someone to commit a wrongdoing

Please use the following format to satisfy the disclosure obligation:

The following is a summary of disclosures received by the Department of Finance and Treasury Board for the 2013-2014 fiscal year.

Information Required under Section 18 of the PIDW Act	Fiscal Year 2013-2014
Number of disclosures received	No disclosures of wrongdoing were received by the Department of Finance & Treasury Board in 2013-2014 or prior years.
Number of findings of wrongdoing	There were no findings of wrongdoing to report because there were no disclosures of wrongdoing received by the department.
Details of each wrongdoing	N/A
Recommendations and actions taken on each wrongdoing	N/A

Appendix B
Treasury Board Division Survey Results, 2013-2014

6. **TB provided helpful and timely advice and guidance regarding the submissions process.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	23	5	47%	34%	37%
Somewhat Agree	21	4	43%	42%	2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	3	8%	16%	-48%
Somewhat Disagree	0	2	0%	8%	-100%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	2%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	49		4.3	4.0	7%

9. TB provided helpful and timely advice and guidance regarding the content of submissions.

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	17	5	36%	32%	12%
Somewhat Agree	25	4	53%	43%	23%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	3	11%	14%	-21%
Somewhat Disagree	0	2	0%	11%	-100%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	47		4.3	4.0	7%

29. **TB provided helpful and timely advice and guidance regarding the governance and accountability of a Government agency.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	4	5	19%	21%	-11%
Somewhat Agree	10	4	48%	43%	11%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	3	24%	21%	11%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2	5%	14%	-67%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	5%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	21		3.7	3.7	0%

33. **TB provided helpful and timely advice and guidance regarding the other matters specified in Question 30.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	6	5	60%	45%	32%
Somewhat Agree	3	4	30%	18%	65%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	0	3	0%	18%	-100%
Somewhat Disagree	0	2	0%	9%	-100%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	10%	9%	10%
Total Response	10		4.3	3.8	13%

37. **Where applicable, pre-budget meetings held with departmental and Finance and Treasury Board Deputy Ministers, including TB and departmental financial staff, were beneficial in preparing for the budget cycle.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	4	5	13%	16%	-22%
Somewhat Agree	16	4	50%	40%	25%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	10	3	31%	16%	95%
Somewhat Disagree	2	2	6%	20%	-69%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	8%	-100%
Total Response	32		3.7	3.4	10%

38. The Preliminary Net Impact, provided at the start of the budget process, resulted in clear expectations regarding prioritization of departmental pressures and reductions.

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	0	5	0%	17%	-100%
Somewhat Agree	10	4	36%	34%	4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	3	25%	14%	81%
Somewhat Disagree	10	2	36%	21%	73%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	4%	14%	-74%
Total Response	28		2.9	3.2	-9%

39. The budget template is an effective tool for submitting departmental budget pressures and reductions.

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	1	5	3%	11%	-74%
Somewhat Agree	16	4	46%	33%	37%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	3	6%	15%	-61%
Somewhat Disagree	12	2	34%	26%	32%
Strongly Disagree	4	1	11%	15%	-23%
Total Response	35		2.9	3.0	-2%

40. The information requested for each pressure and reduction submitted positively impacted the budget submission process.

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	0	5	0%	7%	-100%
Somewhat Agree	15	4	45%	24%	88%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	8	3	24%	17%	41%
Somewhat Disagree	8	2	24%	34%	-30%
Strongly Disagree	2	1	6%	17%	-65%
Total Response	33		3.1	2.7	15%

41. The design and format of the budget template added value to the overall budget process.

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	0	5	0%	11%	-100%
Somewhat Agree	13	4	37%	22%	67%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	3	11%	30%	-61%
Somewhat Disagree	13	2	37%	19%	101%
Strongly Disagree	5	1	14%	19%	-23%
Total Response	35		2.7	2.9	-6%

42. **TB provided appropriate communication regarding the budget process, due dates, and timelines throughout the process.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	6	5	17%	28%	-38%
Somewhat Agree	16	4	46%	41%	10%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	0	3	0%	7%	-100%
Somewhat Disagree	10	2	29%	14%	107%
Strongly Disagree	3	1	9%	10%	-17%
Total Response	35		3.3	3.6	-8%

43. **The inclusion of FTE reporting in the department targets will enable greater control and monitoring of FTEs.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	5	5	15%	10%	46%
Somewhat Agree	19	4	58%	34%	67%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	3	12%	17%	-30%
Somewhat Disagree	2	2	6%	17%	-65%
Strongly Disagree	3	1	9%	21%	-56%
Total Response	33		3.6	3.0	23%

44. An earlier start date to the budget process would be helpful.

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	12	5	31%	N/A	#VALUE!
Somewhat Agree	14	4	36%	N/A	#VALUE!
Neither Agree nor Disagree	8	3	21%	N/A	#VALUE!
Somewhat Disagree	4	2	10%	N/A	#VALUE!
Strongly Disagree	1	1	3%	N/A	#VALUE!
Total Response	39		3.8	N/A	#VALUE!

45. **The overall length of the budget cycle is appropriate.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	2	5	6%	13%	-58%
Somewhat Agree	20	4	56%	43%	28%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	3	11%	20%	-44%
Somewhat Disagree	8	2	22%	13%	67%
Strongly Disagree	2	1	6%	10%	-44%
Total Response	36		3.3	3.4	-1%

47. **TB provides effective guidance for TCA submission requirements (content and process).**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	8	5	30%	29%	4%
Somewhat Agree	14	4	52%	29%	81%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1	3	4%	10%	-61%
Somewhat Disagree	3	2	11%	33%	-67%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	4%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	27		3.9	3.5	11%

48. **The parameters (limits on total number/cost of project requests) of the TCA program are clear.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	8	5	30%	23%	30%
Somewhat Agree	10	4	37%	27%	36%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	3	15%	23%	-35%
Somewhat Disagree	4	2	15%	27%	-46%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	4%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	27		3.7	3.5	8%

49. **The TCA submission deadlines are clear.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	11	5	41%	50%	-19%
Somewhat Agree	15	4	56%	32%	75%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	0	3	0%	0%	#DIV/0!
Somewhat Disagree	0	2	0%	18%	-100%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	4%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	27		4.3	4.1	4%

50. **There is reasonable lead time to meet required deadlines for TCA submissions.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	6	5	22%	9%	144%
Somewhat Agree	13	4	48%	36%	32%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	3	19%	5%	307%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2	4%	41%	-91%
Strongly Disagree	2	1	7%	9%	-19%
Total Response	27		3.7	3.0	27%

51. **It is clear who to contact at TB for clarification of TCA requirements and information.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	13	5	48%	25%	93%
Somewhat Agree	10	4	37%	35%	6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	3	7%	5%	48%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2	4%	30%	-88%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	4%	5%	-26%
Total Response	27		4.2	3.5	22%

52. **TB provides helpful advice and information to inform new or revised TCA submissions.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	8	5	31%	9%	238%
Somewhat Agree	15	4	58%	27%	112%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1	3	4%	27%	-86%
Somewhat Disagree	2	2	8%	36%	-79%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	26		4.1	3.1	33%

53. **TB clearly explains the content for statement of mandate/business plan or accountability report to be submitted by my department.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	26	5	54%	38%	43%
Somewhat Agree	13	4	27%	51%	-47%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	3	6%	3%	131%
Somewhat Disagree	5	2	10%	8%	28%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	2%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	48		4.2	4.2	0%

54. **The written guidelines provided on statement of mandate/business plan or accountability report are informative and helpful.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	21	5	45%	32%	38%
Somewhat Agree	16	4	34%	49%	-30%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	3	9%	8%	5%
Somewhat Disagree	6	2	13%	11%	18%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	47		4.1	4.0	2%

55. **TB is clear about deadlines for draft and final submissions for statement of mandate/business plan or accountability report.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	30	5	61%	59%	3%
Somewhat Agree	16	4	33%	30%	10%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	3	6%	5%	13%
Somewhat Disagree	0	2	0%	5%	-100%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	49		4.6	4.4	3%

56. **There is reasonable lead time to meet required deadlines for the statement of mandate/business plan or accountability report.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	19	5	41%	24%	74%
Somewhat Agree	16	4	35%	58%	-40%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	3	9%	8%	10%
Somewhat Disagree	2	2	4%	11%	-59%
Strongly Disagree	5	1	11%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	46		3.9	3.9	-1%

57. **TB is clear about the approval and feedback process on the statement of mandate/business plan or accountability report.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	23	5	50%	31%	59%
Somewhat Agree	13	4	28%	43%	-34%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	3	13%	20%	-35%
Somewhat Disagree	4	2	9%	6%	52%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	46		4.2	4.0	5%

58. **It is clear who to contact at TB for clarification on the statement of mandate/business plan or accountability report.**

	Response Total	Points	2013-14 Response	2012-13 Response	2013-14 vs 2012-13
Strongly Agree	35	5	76%	56%	36%
Somewhat Agree	8	4	17%	38%	-55%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	3	4%	6%	-26%
Somewhat Disagree	1	2	2%	0%	#DIV/0!
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	0%	#DIV/0!
Total Response	46		4.7	4.5	4%

59. **TB clearly communicated the purposes, parameters and processes of expenditure management projects.**

	Response Total	Points	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Strongly Agree	1	5	5%	3%	52%
Somewhat Agree	6	4	29%	50%	-43%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	3	24%	19%	27%
Somewhat Disagree	8	2	38%	13%	205%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	5%	16%	-70%
Total Response	21		2.9	3.1	-7%

60. **TB clearly communicated the requirements and deadlines of expenditure management projects.**

	Response Total	Points	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Strongly Agree	2	5	10%	9%	7%
Somewhat Agree	8	4	40%	44%	-9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	3	25%	25%	0%
Somewhat Disagree	5	2	25%	9%	167%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	13%	-100%
Total Response	20		3.4	3.3	2%

61. **It is clear who to contact at TB for direction and advice on TB sponsored expenditure management projects.**

	Response Total	Points	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Strongly Agree	2	5	9%	17%	-45%
Somewhat Agree	10	4	45%	53%	-15%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	3	9%	10%	-9%
Somewhat Disagree	7	2	32%	10%	218%
Strongly Disagree	1	1	5%	10%	-55%
Total Response	22		3.2	3.6	-10%

62. **I understand how we can provide input to and acquire feedback from TB on expenditure management projects.**

	Response Total	Points	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Strongly Agree	0	5	0%	6%	-100%
Somewhat Agree	10	4	48%	23%	111%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	3	14%	26%	-45%
Somewhat Disagree	6	2	29%	23%	27%
Strongly Disagree	2	1	10%	23%	-58%
Total Response	21		3.0	2.7	12%

63. **My department's input and advice is considered in the analysis of expenditure management projects.**

	Response Total	Points	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Strongly Agree	1	5	5%	13%	-64%
Somewhat Agree	6	4	29%	30%	-5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	3	29%	20%	43%
Somewhat Disagree	6	2	29%	27%	7%
Strongly Disagree	2	1	10%	10%	-5%
Total Response	21		2.9	3.1	-6%

64. **TB ensures I am made aware of their recommendations on expenditure management projects.**

	Response Total	Points	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Strongly Agree	1	5	5%	3%	48%
Somewhat Agree	5	4	24%	32%	-26%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	3	24%	29%	-18%
Somewhat Disagree	10	2	48%	26%	85%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0%	10%	-100%
Total Response	21		2.9	2.9	-3%